

SPEAKERS' RESPONSIBILITIES

- A. **General:** There are two people per team. Each team will go both affirmative and negative. As a rule, the person who is known as "First Affirmative" is "Second Negative" when the team debates the negative side. Similarly, the person who is "Second Affirmative" will be "First Negative."

B. **Speaker Order and Responsibilities:**

1. **First Affirmative Constructive:** This is the first speech in the debate and maybe written out ahead of time. The speaker reads this speech (it is not memorized). There are certain key elements that must be in this speech in order for the affirmative team to have a "prima facie" (or, "stands at first glance") case. When one speaks of a "burden of proof" lying with the affirmative, it means only that the affirmative must show in the first speech that there is a problem now (in the Status Quo), that there is a solution (adoption of the resolution, ex. - juveniles be given the right to a jury trial), and that the solution will solve the problem presented. An affirmative case is as follows (the order may be changed):

- a. **Introduction:** Usually a short quote related to the topic (often from Bartlett's Quotations, etc.) tied in with the transition statement to the actual resolution.

Example: "Because the juvenile justice system has not met its goals, we, the affirmative, stand resolved that: Juveniles be given the constitutional right to a jury trial in criminal offenses." (From a previous year's case)

- b. **Case:** This is where the affirmative makes its "case" -i.e. presents the problem in the Status Quo - to justify why the resolution should be adopted. There are three components involved:

- i. **Inherence:** There is a problem in the Status Quo which cannot be solved under the existing structure of laws. The affirmative must show that this has resulted in:

- ii. **Harms:** What are all the problems caused by the Status Quo? This is the place to describe them, with a piece of evidence to substantiate that each harm presented does in fact occur because of the inherency problem. Finally, the affirmative must show:

- iii. **Significance:** That the harms shown are significant harms. How many people are affected? What are the results of these harms to lives?

- c. **Plan:** After showing that there is a problem by covering the three areas above, the affirmative must show that it can solve the problem by presenting a plan. The plan can be very simple, i.e. the affirmative only adopts the resolution, or it can be complex, where the affirmative explains how the resolution will be implemented. The advantage to spelling out more detail in the plan is that it offsets some negative plan attacks right up front. (They can't accuse the affirmative of overlooking ramifications of their plan).

- d. **Solvency:** This is the last step - here the affirmative draws the "causal link" between the problem and the solution, stating that their plan will solve the problem they presented and that there will be either (1) no more problems/harms or (2) advantages over the status quo. It depends on how completely the plan solves the problem (sometimes the best plans can only claim to improve the situation, which is an advantage, as opposed to fixing it.) Usually, the First Affirmative only states, ex. - "Adoption of the Affirmative proposal will solve/improve the status quo, therefore we ask for an affirmative judgment in today's debate." It is up to the Second Affirmative to prove the causal link in detail (with evidence, etc.)

2. **First Affirmative Cross Examination:** - questions asked by Second Negative.

Cross examination is the point at which the opposing debaters get to play Perry Mason. There are two strategies that can be mixed and matched, a) to get information or clarify points made in the First Affirmative's speech that were unclear; b) to embarrass the opponents by trapping them into admitting a contradiction or lack of knowledge. The entire goal is to keep control on questioning. Please refer to the Cross Examination Sheet for specifics; however, a few will be reviewed here.

- a. The questioner (in this case, 2nd Neg.) can only ask questions. He/she cannot make statements, cannot argue. The questioner may bring up a point and ask the Affirmative for a response. Keep in mind that the point of cross examination is to ask as many questions as possible - you will have your chance to speak on the floor so do not waste your cross examination making points here.
- b. While 2nd Neg. is asking questions, 1st Neg. is preparing his/her speech. Any time taken to prepare beyond the cross examination period counts against the Negative's total prep time.

3. **First Negative Constructive:** This is the first major negative speech. This speaker is responsible for addressing the CASE portion of the First *Affirmative* (not the PLAN or SOLVENCY). In other words, 'First Negative'

- a. There is no inherent problem in the Status Quo.
- b. Any harms that the Affirmative mentioned are not due to the Status Quo.
- c. Those harms are not significant.
- d. Any problems in the Status Quo can be remedied with Minor Repairs; i.e. we do not need the structural change proposed by the Affirmative in order to solve problems. Rather, we simply need more money, manpower, etc in the existing structure to make it work.

Example: The Affirmative claims that juvenile court judges are poorly trained. Negative response: we do not need to provide jury trials in order to solve the poor training of judges. We need only require that judges meet a minimum standard of training in order to serve. That is not a structural change (we do not need to change any laws in order to put this into effect.)

- e. You may also argue that the Status Quo is already solving these problems on the state and local level - that we do not need a Supreme Court decision to be reversed in order to solve the problem (this is a further step under the INHERENCY -response; see a. above).

4. **First Negative Cross Examination** - questions asked by First Affirmative.

5. **Second Affirmative Constructive:** This speech refutes the arguments the First Negative just brought up. The 2nd Aff. basically goes back down the 1st Aff. outline and rebuilds the points by proving the Negative attacks are incorrect, or weak, or the evidence is outdated, etc. The 2nd Aff. repeats the 1st Aff. arguments but reads new evidence to support the points. Second Affirmative is also responsible for proving SOLVENCY, i.e. showing how the plan will solve the problem.

Example: Search warrants will minimize the possibility of teachers overstepping the "reasonable suspicion" test *which is* an inherent problem in the current system. According to "... (read quote).

2nd Aff. outline would be as follows:

- a. Rebuild Inherency
- b. Reestablish Harms
- c. Reestablish Significance
- d. Prove that any Minor Repairs (see 3.d.) mentioned by Negative team won't solve the problem.
- e. Show that Status Quo repairs are not working.
- f. Show that only the Affirmative plan will solve the problem.

6. **Second Affirmative Cross Examination:** - questions asked by First Negative.
7. **Second Negative Constructive:** This Negative speaker concentrates on showing that the Affirmative PLAN will not work. The 2nd Neg. does not go over what the 1 st Neg. or 2nd Aff. have said (that will be covered in 1st Neg. rebuttal). Rather, the 2nd Neg. goes right to the PLAN side and presents PLAN ATTACKS. Plan attacks are usually written out ahead of time. They may be read, although it is far more persuasive to sound spontaneous. Tailor the plan attacks to the particular plan. You may have thirty general plan attacks written out before the tournament and only ten of there will apply to a particular plan. DON'T READ PLAN ATTACKS THAT DONT APPLY. In general there are two main types of Plan Attacks:
- a. **Plan Meets Needs Attack** (or Plan Meet Advantages Attack, depending on the Affirmative case.) These are also known as PMN's. These essentially say that the Affirmative plan will NOT meet its stated needs (or problems). In other words, the CASE that the Affirmative presented concerning problems cannot be solved by the PLAN. Recall that 2nd Aff. has just gotten up and said that the PLAN will solve the problem. Now Negative refutes that contention.
- Example 1: 2nd Neg. would argue that there would still be the possibility of illegal searches even if warrants were obtained in advanced. Therefore, Affirmative *PLAN* cannot meet their need. There is another specific type of PMN known as workability. These are PMNs which specifically attack the mechanism of the Affirmative PLAN.
- Example 2: How are teachers going to have time to get a warrant? What about emergency situations? The workability attack looks at the mechanics, therefore an Affirmative PLAN that is more specific will circumvent many of these workability attacks right up front. The more general the PLAN the more likely the workability attacks will work.
- b. **Disadvantages Attack:** The Negative team shows that adoption of the Affirmative proposal will result in significant disadvantages. For instance:
- Example 3: Students possessing weapons will pose a danger to the student body if teachers need search warrants for any type of search. The 2nd Neg. would then read evidence that supports that contention.
- Example 4: The proposal turns teachers into police officers; juveniles need special protective taws, etc.
- Be inventive! These Disadvantages arguments can be written out ahead of time and used over and over in different rounds against different plans. Make sure, however, that you number each one and announce it.
8. **Second Negative Cross Examination:** - questions asked by Second Affirmative.
9. **Rebuttal:** This is the point in the debate to summarize arguments, to finally refute whatever arguments have been advanced by the other team and to shore up your side. The First Negative speaker proceeds first, and should concentrate on attack of Affirmative's PLAN and the need for change.

No new arguments can be introduced in Rebuttal. This does not mean that new evidence cannot be introduced to support arguments already raised or answering arguments introduced by opponents.

See attached for further discussion of Cross Examination and general principles of debating. A one page summary of debate format and speakers' duties follows the judging information and will be given to all judges.

TIME LIMITS FOR YOUNG PEOPLES' DEBATE

1.	1st. Affirmative Constructive speech	5 mins
2.	1st Affirmative is questioned' by 2nd Negative	2 mins
3:	1st Negative. Constructive speech	5 mins
4.	1st Negative is questioned by 1st Affirmative	2 mins
5.	2nd Affirmative Constructive speech	5 mins
6	2nd Affirmative is questioned by 1st Negative	2: mins
7.	2nd Negative Constructive speech	5 mins
8.	2nd Negative is questioned by 2nd Affirmative	2 mins
9.	1st Negative Rebuttal	3 mins
10.	1st Affirmative Rebuttal	3 mins
11.	2nd Negative Rebuttal	3 mins
12.	2nd Affirmative Rebuttal	3 mins

Also, each team has five (5) minutes of Preparation Time to be taken at any time during the debate in increments of sixty (60) seconds each. The timekeeper will keep track of this.

Judges may ask each speaker if, he/she wishes to take any of the preparation time before each speech.

CROSS EXAMINATION DEBATING

By Lloyd H. Fuge
and Robert P. Newman
of the University of Pittsburgh

Cross Examination is more than the art of debate. All the essential elements of good debate are necessary: A strong case, good adaptation to the audience, adequate evidence, and skillful delivery. Good cross examination demands, in addition, a quick wit and facile tongue.

General

A. Purpose of Cross Examination

To clarify an obscure point in an opponent's case, to expose factual error or unsupported assertion, or to obtain damaging admissions are the purposes of cross examination. It should not be used (as it is in law) to attack the witness' personal integrity.

B. Attitudes of Questioner and Witness

Both should appear to be reasonable, cooperative and eager to please. Either one should be "marked down" for unpalatable sarcasm, obvious "stalling," or appearing to browbeat the opponent.

C. Relation to Case

The virtue of any cross examination decreases unless the results are tied to later speeches. The cross examination should be an 'integral part of the debate, not a sideshow.

D. Delivery

Both speakers must talk to the audience. Cross examination takes the form of an exchange between two debaters, but basically, it is for the benefit of the listeners. In public debates it is vital that both speakers face the audience while questioning or responding.

The Questioner

A. Controls the time, and may interrupt the witness to request shorter or more direct answers, or to indicate that the answer given is insufficient.

B. Must ask fair and relevant questions. The questioner should neither comment on the answers, argue with the witness, nor make speeches. He/she should use the time for questioning alone, not for either constructive argument or summary. In fact, a conclusion is all the more effective if the audience reaches it without the questioner's help.

C. Should have considerable scope in the questions asked. Since the time is his/hers, the questioner may waste time if he/she wants to. The witness should answer even if the significance or relevance of the question is not immediately apparent.

D. Should begin with common ground on which agreement may be expected, and proceed to areas in which disagreement develops or the witness makes significant admissions. The questioner may well begin with questions which reveal his purpose: "Do you maintain that the Nationalist Chinese Army stands as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?" "Yes." "And do you further maintain that recognition of Red China would weaken or destroy this bulwark?" "Yes." Agreement on such questions is almost certain, and the questioner clearly indicates the direction of the inquiry.

- E.** *Should develop his/her attack along the lines of his/her basic case.* The questioner should limit the number of objectives that they are trying to reach. A series of at least five questions, probing a single issue of the debate thoroughly and following up leads which the witness' answers provide, is preferable to a miscellaneous assortment of questions lacking interrelation and adaptation to the witness' answers.
- F.** *May not insist on a simple "Yes or "No" answer unless the question is simple, direct and factual.* Questions about why something is true are necessarily complicated and the questioner cannot expect the witness to answer them briefly. Factual questions are best, and the questioner can ask them in enough different ways to lend variety to the cross examination.
- G.** *Should phrase questions with the verb first, then the subject, and finally the object or modifying phrase: e.g. "Do you admit that Joseph R. McCarthy is the junior senator from Wisconsin?"* Negative questions should be avoided, or any phrasing with "not": "Do you not know that there have been thirty seven violations of the Korean truce by the Red Chinese?" The answer to this can only be confusing.
- H.** *May remind the audience and the witness of a relevant fact by beginning the question: "Are you aware that ..." or "Are you familiar with ..."* However, the questioner's motive in asking such questions should be to put the witness on the record concerning the statement involved, and not to present materials of his/her own.
- I.** *Should summarize a series of questions on an issue by repeating an opening question: "Do you still consider, in light of these facts, that the Chinese Nationalist Army stands as a bulwark against Communism in Asia?"* This calls for a "Yes" or "No" answer, and clearly indicates that the questioner has concluded that particular approach, and allows the members of the audience to draw their own conclusions.

The Witness

- A.** *Must answer directly and briefly any legitimate question susceptible to a simple answer* He/she should not question the questioner (except in using a rhetorical question as an answer, nor should the witness engage in "stalling" tactics.
- B.** *May refuse to answer a tricky or unfair question* if he/she states a good reason for doing so.
- C.** *May ask questions to clarify a question possibly giving reasons for considering the question obscure, or may ask the questioner to stop making speeches and to continue the questioning.*
- D.** *May clarify a question, if to do so is appropriate.* The witness should state the qualification before answering: "Do you believe in the desirability of democratic elections?" "For people educated in the tradition and practice of democracy, yes."

INSTRUCTIONS FOR JUDGES

Young Peoples' Debates

1. There will be one judge for each debate. Judges will be provided by each participating school (one judge for every two teams, minimum one judge). This can either be the teacher-coach or another TRAINED person.
2. No written briefs or any other written materials are submitted or used for this debate contest. The emphasis should be on oral argument and critical thinking skills.
3. Ballots will be filled out by each judge (see sample attached) during the debate. You should keep notes about the round on your "Flow Chart," (see attached) not on the ballot. At the end of the round, judges should review their flow sheets and conclude which team won which arguments. In an average debate there will be at least ten arguments, of which each team may win some. Some arguments will be a draw and drop out of the debate. Others will clearly be won by one side or the other. The judges evaluate who won what, and then decide, on balance, which side did the better debating. Whichever team won more arguments in the judge's mind wins the round. This should be noted on the ballot - explain which team won which argument under "Reason for Decision."
4. Judges will then assign speaker points based on a thirty-point system. Rate each speaker on a five point scale (1 - poor, to 5 - superior) for each of the criteria (explained below) and come up with a total score for that speaker. Then, based on the total speaker points, Rank the speakers in order (the highest speaker point total is first, next highest is 2nd, etc.) **The combined team total for the winning team should be greater than the combined total for the losing team.** Judges should write specific comments on each scoresheet.
 - a. **Analysis** - how well did the speaker assess the arguments presented?
 - b. **Evidence** - how well did this speaker support his/her arguments?
 - c. **Refutation** - how well did the speaker respond to the opposition's arguments?
 - d. **Reasoning** - how well did the speaker logically argue?
 - e. **Organization** - how well did the speaker structure his/her speech and follow the case as defined by the Affirmative?
 - f. **Delivery** - how well did the speaker present him/herself? (speech, pace, etc.)
5. Decisions of the judges are final. The Coordinator will be in charge of collecting all scoresheets from the judges. **SCORES WILL NOT BE AVAILABLE AFTER ROUND**, and students should NOT be told whether they won or lost by the Judge. Scoresheets, with comments, will be provided at the end of the day to coaches.
6. Tournament results are based on the following:
 - a. win/loss record is most important.
 - b. Total speaker points is used to break ties in win/loss records
 - c. Individual speaker points are tallied as well - total speaker points for each speaker are accumulated and Speaker trophies are awarded for Outstanding Speaker (1 st, 2nd , 3rd)
 - d. School sweepstakes points are based on overall school performance.

GUIDELINES FOR JUDGING

Young Peoples' Debate

1. Judge the round with an open mind. Don't let your own feelings or beliefs influence your judgment.
2. DO give constructive criticism - but not until AFTER the round. DON'T be too harsh. Keep in mind that most students have never done public speaking before, and need encouragement. Try NOT to interrupt the round unless it absolutely comes to a halt for some reason.
3. Save the 5 points (superior rating) for truly outstanding speakers
4. Don't score right on the ballot - you might change your mind. ADD UP THE POINTS VERY CAREFULLY. We have had many bad feelings over mistakes in tallying. For this reason, we ask that results NOT BE DIVULGED until the ballots can be checked.
5. Remember that arguments must be "pulled through" the round. Points and arguments made in constructive speeches should be repeated in rebuttals or they are said to be "dropped."
6. Try not to place too much emphasis on delivery - try to concentrate on WHAT is being said as well as HOW it is being said.
7. No new arguments can be introduced in rebuttal - but new evidence can be brought to sustain arguments already mentioned.
8. Cross-examination tends to be the most difficult but most interesting part of the debate. The questioner should control the questioning: that is, the questioner can interrupt the answer should it become too long. On the other hand, the questioner cannot insist on a "yes" or "no" answer to a complicated question.
9. IMPORTANT: USE THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES FOR SCORING:

27-30	excellent
24-26	very good
20-23	good
16-19	average
below 16	poor

This helps us very much with consistency for the state tournament.

THANK YOU!

FLOW CHART

Topic:

Date:

Constructive

Rebuttal

1st Affirmative	1st Negative	2nd Affirmative	2nd Negative	1st Negative I	1st Affirmative	2nd Negative	2nd Affirmative

Division _____ Round _____ Room _____ Judge _____

Affirmative _____ Negative _____

Check the column on each item which, on the following scale, best describes your evaluation of the debtor's effectiveness:

1-poor

2-fair

3-average

4-excellent

5-superior

1 st Affirmative					
_____ (Name)					
1	2	3	4	5	

2 nd Affirmative					
_____ (Name)					
1	2	3	4	5	

Analysis
Reasoning
Evidence
Organization
Refutation
Delivery

1 st Negative					
_____ (Name)					
1	2	3	4	5	

2 nd Negative					
_____ (Name)					
1	2	3	4	5	

Total _____ Rank _____

Total _____ Rank _____

Total _____ Rank _____

Total _____ Rank _____

Rank each debator in order of excellence (1st for best, 2nd for next best, etc.) _____

In my opinion, this debate was won by _____ representing _____
(Aff. or Neg.) (School and/or #)

(Judge's Name)

(School)

COMMENTS AND BASIS FOR DECISION:

DEBATE FORMAT and SPEAKERS' DUTIES

Constructive

Rebuttal

<u>1st Affirmative</u>	<u>1st Negative</u>	<u>2nd Affirmative</u>	<u>2nd Negative</u>	<u>1st Neg</u>	<u>1st Aff</u>	<u>2nd Neg</u>	<u>2nd Aff</u>
-----	-----Introduce yourself and	state the side you represent---	-----				
<u>Purpose:</u> Present strong case to support resolution - take offensive, Explain reason for Importance of topic. State resolution, Define any terms that might have shades of meaning. <u>M u s t :</u> Prove NEED fir change called for in the resolution by showing HARM caused by present situation. <u>Introduce:</u> PLAN for change to meet NEED. Give advantages of PLAN. (No PLAN required In values debate)	<u>State:</u> Your sides philosophical position (the values threatened by the Affirmative proposal), Give Negative's position. <u>Must:</u> Show no NEED for change by: 1. Direct refutation of the NEEDS stated by 1st Affirmative. Attack their evidence or logic. AND / OR 2. Defend the status quo (way things are now). Prove that things are fine just the way they are, OR 3. Only minor repairs are needed on the present system. Cite evidence. Summarize persuasively.	<u>Must:</u> Answer attack by 1st Negative on your team's NEED for change statement. Present new advantages. Give further evidence for NEED for change. Refute Negative's claims. <u>Elaborate:</u> On PLAN and give its advantages. Give details on how effectively it will work. <u>Provide:</u> Evidence to s u p p o r t . Argue from own case, not Negative. Summarize persuasively.	<u>Must:</u> Attack PLAN on the basis of its: 1. Workability - PLAN <u>will</u> n work If put Into effect. 2. Unable to really meet NEEDS described by Affirmative. 3. Disadvantages of the PLAN. Describe potential problems thal will arise. 4. Unable to produce alleged changes that the Affirmative wants to bring about. Can refer to Negative's philosophy and how it relates to Affirmative's PLAN and philosophy. Argue from own case, not Affirmative. Summarize persuasively,	Attack Affirmative NEED for Change argument. Develop Negative Position further with evidence. Continue to show how PLAN won't meet NEED. Focus attention on major issues. Give summary conclusion of what Negative has proven & what Affirmative must still do.	Answer all arguments made by the Negative towards NEED for change and PLAN for that change. Focus attention on major issues. Give summary emphasizing strength of own case. Point out what Negative has failed to prove.	Summarize own case-defense of present system. Refute Affirmative's replies. Point out issues Affirmative failed to discuss. Call for rejection of PLAN and/or resolution. Can be emotional. Focus on major issues.	Call for acceptance of PLAN and resolution. Can be emotional. Summarize own case. Give reasons for why your argument should win refuting Negative replies.
Time: 5 min.	5 min.	5 min.	5 min.	3 min.	3 min.	3 min.	3 min.
Intra team conferences:	5 Minutes	total during	the Debate.				
Cross Ex: 2 min.	2 min.	2 min.	2 min.				